

### **Remarks**

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed December 20, 2004. An appropriate Petition for Extension of Time to Respond is submitted herewith, together with the appropriate fee.

#### **I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections**

Prior to the Office Action mailed December 20, 2004, Claims 1-39 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action mailed December 20, 2004, Claims 7, 24, 30-33 and 36-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim that which Applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1, 2, 5-13, 15, 17-19, 22, 30, 32 and 34-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wiederhold (U.S. Patent No. 6,226,745). Claims 3, 4, 14, 16, 20, 21, 31 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Wiederhold in view of java.sun.com and/or javaworld.com.

#### **II. Summary of Applicant's Amendments**

The present Response amends Claims 1, 7, 18, 24, 30, 35 and 36, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-39. Reconsideration of the Application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Applicant reserves the right to prosecute any originally presented claims in a continuing or future application.

#### **III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112**

##### **Claims 7, 24, 30-33, 36 and 37**

In the Office Action mailed December 20, 2004, Claims 7, 24, 30-33 and 36-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim that which Applicant regards as the invention. Accordingly, Claims 7, 24, 30 and 35 have been amended by the current Response to correct any indefiniteness. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as amended, together with the claims dependent therefrom, now properly conform to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

#### **IV. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102**

In the Office Action mailed December 20, 2004, Claims 1, 2, 5-13, 15, 17-19, 22, 30, 32 and 34-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wiederhold (U.S. Patent No. 6,226,745).

##### **Claim 1**

Claim 1 has been amended by the current Response to more clearly define the embodiment of the invention therein. As amended, Claim 1 defines:

1. *(Currently Amended) A security system for allowing a client to access a protected resource or application, said application including an application container, comprising:  
an application interface mechanism for receiving a request from a client to access a protected application, and communicating said request to a security service, wherein the client makes the request on the application container, and the application container calls the security service with the request and a callback;  
a security service for making a decision to permit or deny said request, wherein the security service includes a plurality of security providers that may be plugged into the security service, and wherein the security providers use the callback handler to request context information from the application container for the request, and wherein depending on the output from the security providers the security service determines an entitlement for the client to use with the protected application; and  
a resource interface for communicating permitted access requests to said protected application.*

Claim 1, as currently amended, defines an application interface mechanism for receiving a request from a client to access a protected application. The client makes the request on the application container, and the application container calls the security service with the request and a callback. The security service includes a plurality of security providers that may be plugged into the security service, and which use the callback handler to request context information from the

application container for the request. Depending on the output from the security providers, the security service determines an entitlement for the client to use with the protected application.

The advantages of the system defined by Claim 1 include that security may be expressed from the point of view of an application instead of the infrastructure. Traditional security mechanisms tend to be context-less since they are based solely on permissions granted a principal for a given resource; therefore, the only types of authorization decisions that can be made are whether the principal has the necessary permissions to access the resource. In accordance with Claim 1, a pluggable architecture allows security and business logic plugins to be inserted into a security service hosted by a server, and to control access to one or more secured resources. A request context may include the identity of the target object, the value of the parameter of the request, and potentially environmental information such as the network or IP address of the initiating client. The providing of context information without prior knowledge is accomplished by using callbacks to the containers from the authorization provider. The container delegates authorization decisions to the security service when the container later makes a request to access a protected resource, thus moving the point of enforcement from the container to the security service.

Wiederhold discloses a security mediator system for use in a computer system having a database of information to be shared with authorized users in accordance with pre-defined constraints. A rules database stores rules, including query pre-processing rules and query results post-processing rules. (Abstract). Retrieved results are validated before transmission of the retrieved information to the requestor. (Column 3, lines 46-49). The security mediator uses rules to determine the validity of every query and make decisions pertaining to the dissemination of information. The system helps the security officer enter appropriate rules and update them as the security needs of the organization change. The rules are preferably simple, short and comprehensive. They are stored in the rules database with all edit rights restricted to the security officer. Once the rules are entered into the system by the officer, all the rules applicable to a particular user will be checked for every query issued by that user in every session. (Column 5, lines 36-58).

It appears from the above description that, in Wiederhold, a security officer (or officers) enters a set of rules into a central rules database. During a particular session, each time a query is issued by a user, the rules in the rules database are checked. Appropriate rules for that user are applied, (including where applicable both query pre-processing rules and query results post-processing rules), before transmission of the requested information back to the user.

However, Applicant respectfully submits that Wiederhold appears to disclose an otherwise traditional security mechanism, wherein the infrastructure itself (the mediator) is the single point-of-enforcement that makes all of the security decisions; the difference being that, in Wiederhold, the mediator is designed as a two-way "fence" that intercepts queries coming in and, likewise, results going out. (Column 4, lines 57-59). Applicant respectfully submits that Wiederhold does not appear to disclose or suggest a security service that includes a plurality of security providers that may be plugged into the security service, and wherein the security providers use the callback handler to request context information from the application container for the request, and wherein depending on the output from the security providers the security service determines an entitlement for the client to use with the protected application, as defined by Claim 1.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

#### **Claims 18 and 35**

The comments provided above with respect to Claim 1 are incorporated herein by reference. Claims 18 and 35 have been amended similarly to Claim 1 to more clearly define the embodiment therein. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 18 and 35 are likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Application No.: 09/878,536  
Reply to Office Action dated: December 20, 2004  
Reply dated: June 20, 2005

**Claims 2, 5-13, 15, 17, 19, 22, 30, 32, 34 and 36-39**

Claims 2, 5-13, 15, 17, 19, 22, 30, 32, 34 and 36-39 are not addressed separately but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

**V. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

**Claims 3, 4, 14, 16, 20, 21, 31 and 33**

In the Office Action mailed December 20, 2004, Claims 3, 4, 14, 16, 20, 21, 31 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Wiederhold (U.S. Patent No. 6,226,745) in view of java.sun.com and/or javaworld.com.

Claims 3, 4, 14, 16, 20, 21, 31 and 33 are not addressed separately but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

Application No.: 09/878,536  
Reply to Office Action dated: December 20, 2004  
Reply dated: June 20, 2005

**VI. Conclusion**


In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

Enclosed is a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for extending the time to respond up to and including June 20, 2005.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 20, 2005

By:   
Karl F. Kenna  
Reg. No. 45,445

FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-4156  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800